

ANALYSIS OF EUROPEAN PRESS COVERAGE OF  
GAITSKILL-KHRUSHCHEV DINNER EPISODE

A survey of the non-British European press following the London dinner at which British Labor Party leaders angered Khrushchev with requests for release of imprisoned Social Democrats suggests that the possibility of a Popular Front alliance between Communists and Socialists is cause for alarm among politicians of all other shades of opinion. Among the Socialists themselves, opinion while generally opposed to such an alliance, is less forthrightly expressed in the comments collected by FDD. However, it should be noted that the Socialists firmly rejected the Communist proposal for a "united front" at both the full Council meeting of the Socialist International in Zurich and at a special executive Bureau meeting in London in April.

The 34 newspapers which were examined in this survey included publications from: Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, West Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, Norway, Sweden and Switzerland. They vary in political orientation, expressing the Communist, Socialist, liberal, conservative, and independent points of view. Of the 34, 13 are Communist, eight independent, six Socialist or Socialist-oriented, five conservative, and two liberal. No definitive opinion can be deduced from a survey so narrowly limited in media and time coverage; however, certain interesting trends appear.

Of the non-Communist papers, 12 of the 14 which expressed an opinion used the incident as an opportunity to point out the fact that there has been no change in the "ideological abyss between Democratic Socialism and dictatorship Communism" (Social-Demokraten, Copenhagen, 26 April) and to emphasize the brutality and intransigence of the Communist reply. It is notable, however, that of these 12 papers, four are conservative, four independent, and one liberal in orientation. Of the Socialist or Socialist-oriented papers, only three took a definite stand against the Popular Front concept. The Paris Franc-Tireur in an extensive comment stated, "The attitude adopted by Khrushchev does not bode well for relations between the Communist Party and the Socialist parties of Europe. It even goes so far as to contradict the Kremlin's reported desire for a rapprochement between the Communist Party and the non-Communist labor movement of western Europe." The Social-Demokraten (Copenhagen) treated the incident in two editorials, one of which said, "... the British Labor Party does not, any more than other Social Democratic parties, desire party cooperation or joint efforts of

any kind with the Communist dictatorship parties." The Austrian Arbeiter-Zeitung, while not commenting specifically on the Popular Front aspect, gave the story front page treatment under a headline, "Khrushchev Refuses To Free The Socialists," and quoted the British press as saying that "Khrushchev, the pleasant teddy bear, was now showing his claws." The other three Socialist papers surveyed gave only factual accounts of the episode.

Of the eight independent papers examined, two gave the story factual treatment (Die Presse, Vienna; Helsingin Sanomat, Finland); the remaining six carried comments ranging from neutral to strongly anti-Soviet. In Italy, where a strong Communist Party has already established a policy of cooperation with the extreme left-wing Nenni Socialists, both independent papers surveyed, La Stampa of Turin and Il Corriere della Sera of Milan, devoted considerable space to combatting the Popular Front policy. La Stampa in a 26 April article from its special correspondent Riccardo Aragno, stated that "Khrushchev's enmity against the Laborites and his intransigence in the matter of freedom and human compassion have cost the Soviets, in exchange for 150 political prisoners, a mass of millions of supporters of the Labor Party and of free thinkers in the entire world." The following day Aragno wrote that Gaitskill had again urged Soviet intervention on behalf of the imprisoned Social Democrats and also had "made it clear that any alliance between the Communists and the Laborites was unthinkable." The influential Il Corriere della Sera carried a story on 25 April from its special correspondent Domenico Bartoli, which stated that the incident was significant because it showed the political and moral incompatibility between Social Democrats and Communists. Next day it quoted the London Times to the effect that Khrushchev's refusal seemed inexplicable because it contradicted the proclaimed desire of the Soviets to promote the formation of popular fronts.

In France where Communist agitation for a Popular Front may be expected to increase, the moderate Figaro commented only that Gaitskill was still intending to visit the USSR if the invitation was still good, while Le Monde warned that Mollet's reception in the USSR was likely to be less warm than he anticipated. In Switzerland where the possibility of a united Front is unlikely, the Neue Zuercher Zeitung reported the scene in strongly anti-Soviet terms and stated that it proved to "illusionists of all parties" the fundamental differences between the Soviet leaders and respectable persons in Great Britain. In addition, it endorsed the Daily Mail statement that the Soviet reaction certainly did not promote the people's front idea.

Both conservative and liberal papers were overwhelmingly pro-West and anti-Popular Front. The Oslo Aftenposten wrote that "between the Socialists of the West and the Moscow Communists, no ideological bridge was built. They still stand on opposite sides of an abyss." The conservative Swedish Svenska Dagbladet described the incident as a "severe setback" for those who are "frenetically propagandizing for a 'Popular Front' in all countries," while the liberal Dagens Nyheter commented that more than smiles, gestures, and toasts was necessary for peace and the relaxation of tension. The same attitude was expressed by two conservative Hamburg papers, Die Welt and Das Abendblatt. The latter commented that the effect of the clash will be to discourage the Labor rebels in the leftist camp who have advocated closer understanding with Russia.

The 13 Communist papers reviewed gave factual coverage or none in six cases; the remaining journals devoted themselves to vilification of the Labor leaders and the British generally. The Finnish Tyokansan Sanomat in addition carried a Soviet Information Bureau report from Moscow criticizing the British Laborites and stating that their action was motivated by a "desire ... to inspire the opponents of united action and united front in the other western countries."

Italian Press Coverage of List of Social Democrats Held Prisoners in USSR

A survey of the Italian press (independent La Stampa of Turin, Communist L'Unita of Rome, independent Il Corriere della Sera of Milan, and the pro-government newspaper Il Giornale d'Italia of Rome) showed that the matter had been well covered, even if not uniformly, and there was no editorial comment.

Specifically, L'Unita of 24 April mentioned that Gaitskell had told B and K, during the dinner tendered them by the Laborites, that he was ready to hand them a list of Social Democrats held in prison in the USSR and also in Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Latvia and Lithuania, and that Khrushchev had replied a) that no Social Democrats were imprisoned in the USSR, and b) it was not within his province to comment on what was going on in other countries. No mention was made of the angry replies of Khrushchev except that he gave a long speech on the historical problems of the development of Socialism in the USSR and how the USSR looks at the problem of coexistence. Renato Mieli, special correspondent of L'Unita, had this to say: "This attitude of the Laborite leaders is undoubtedly due to their concern as to what effect a rapprochement with the Communist Party of the USSR might have within the British movement, forcing the present leaders, sooner or later, to shift to the left of their present policies, both on the domestic and international scene."

The 4 May issue simply stated that Eden had refused to confirm or deny that the list of 200 Social Communists published in the Manchester Guardian had actually been handed over to the Soviet leaders.

1/13/82

La Stampa, in its article of 25 April, gave a factual account of the dinner and on 26 April, it carried the following comment from its special correspondent Riccardo Aragno: "Khrushchev's enmity against the Laborites and his intransigence in the matter of freedom and human compassion have cost the Soviets, in exchange for 150 political prisoners, a mass of millions of supporters of the Labor Party and of free thinkers in the entire world." The 27 April article, also by Riccardo Aragno, stated that during Gaitskell's farewell visit, he again urged Soviet intervention on behalf of the imprisoned Social Democrats, and also made it clear that any alliance between the Communists and the Laborites was unthinkable. On 4 May appeared a factual account of Eden's refusal, in the House of Commons, to confirm or deny that the list containing about 200 names that had appeared in the Manchester Guardian, had actually been handed over to the Soviet leaders.

Il Giornale d'Italia of 25 April gives an additional detail of the Laborite dinner in that Khrushchev, when refusing to accept the list that Gaitskell wanted to give him, actually hit the palm of Gaitskell's hand; and the 27 April article quotes at length from the London Times, which stated that B and K visit was worthwhile if for no other reason than proving to the European Social Democrats the fallacy of informing popular fronts. A factual account of Eden's statement in House of Commons appeared in the 4 May issue.

Domenico Bartoli, special correspondent of Il Corriere della Sera, stated on 25 April that the clash between Khrushchev and the Laborite leaders was very significant in that it shows the political and moral incompatibility between Social Democrats and Communists. The article of

26 April quoted the London Times to the effect that Khrushchev's refusal to do anything about the imprisoned Social Democrats seemed inexplicable because it is in contradiction to the proclaimed desire of the Soviets to promote the formation of popular fronts. Finally, the 4 May issue gave a factual account of Eden's statement in the House of Commons.

X

1/10/81

France

Of the French newspapers covered for reaction to Gaitskell's request that Social Democrats imprisoned behind the Iron Curtain be released, only the Communist dailies Le Patriote du Sud-Ouest of Toulouse and La Marseillaise of Marseille printed no editorial comment whatsoever.

The only comment of Le Figaro, moderate Paris daily, was to the effect that despite the incident at the Labor dinner, Gaitskell intends to follow up Bulganin's invitation to visit the USSR if the invitation still stands.

Le Monde's special correspondent Jean Wetz commented in his report from London, "The repercussions of this controversy could be felt on a wider scale, and Mollet runs the risk of finding a less warm welcome in the USSR than he anticipated."

Franc-Tireur's comment on the incident was more extensive than the others: "The attitude adopted by Khrushchev does not bode well for relations between the Communist Party and the Socialist parties of Europe. It even goes so far as to contradict the Kremlin's reported desire for a rapprochement between the Communist Party and the non-Communist labor movement of western Europe." Another of Franc-Tireur's comments emphasized that Khrushchev's ability to get along with British conservatives better than with the Labor Party is a possible indication of the difficulties which might arise during Mollet's visit to Moscow.

L'Humanite, Paris Communist daily, deplored the fact that the Labor Party leaders made not the slightest constructive contribution

to the conversations, and that since Gaitskell's presentation of the list had been previously announced by the press, the whole incident "appeared to be a maneuver." L'Humanite went on to criticize the British Labor Party for being so closely associated with the Socialist International and for not clearly defining its position on disarmament and European security.

None of the three Communist dailies referred to Eden's refusal to comment on the Manchester Guardian's report that he had submitted the list of Socialist prisoners to B and K. Le Monde printed an AFP dispatch announcing Eden's refusal to admit submitting the list of prisoners, and on 5 May printed an AP dispatch reporting Pravda's reference to the New York Herald Tribune's article saying that the incident had been arranged in New York by the editors of New Leader. Franc-Tireur printed an AFP dispatch giving Eden's statement of regret that the list had been published. Le Figaro of 4 May printed an AP dispatch quoting Pravda's accusation of the Labor Party leaders for having provoked the quarrel with K with the intention of preventing a Socialist-Communist front in the world.



Luxembourg

The only Luxembourg newspaper reviewed, Communist Zeitung, sought to explain the altercation between the Soviet leaders and the British Labor Party leaders by saying the growing anti-British sentiment not only in the Middle East but in all Britain's colonies seems to have irritated the British hosts. It stated that the recent imprisonment of over 100 Cypriot Communists should have prevented Gaitskell and Bevan from raising the provocative question about well-established enemies of the Socialist regime of the USSR and the democratic republics. Zeitung concluded with the statement that "the British contented themselves with noisy utterances in order to distract from the brutal suppression by the government of all freedom movements in the colonies."

X

1/13/87

Austria

Of the three Austrian newspapers reviewed, only Socialist Arbeiter-Zeitung reported in any detail on the altercation between the Soviet leaders and the British Labor Party leaders. Independent Die Presse merely published a short factual item on the dinner. Communist Oesterreichische Volksstimme censured the British Labor leaders for being poor hosts and provoking the Soviet leaders at an affair which the latter had hoped would improve relations between the Socialists and the Communists. Volksstimme further stated that Gaitskell and his friends had earned harsh criticism from their fellow party members and sought to smooth things over with a "friendship visit".

Socialist Arbeiter-Zeitung played up the affair with a front-page banner stating that "Khrushchev Refuses To Free The Socialists"; it reported on the exchange with obvious glee, quoting the British press in saying that "Khrushchev, the pleasant teddy bear, was now showing his claws". The account of the banquet was one of the few front-page accounts of the visit and the only one with prominent, banner headlines.

X

1/13/81

Switzerland

Of the two Swiss daily newspapers reviewed, Communist Vorwaerts practically ignored the exchange between the Soviets leaders and the British Labor Party leaders, merely stating that Khrushchev "portrayed the British policy before World War II when the British and French were urging Hitler to attack the USSR and the USSR consequently was forced to sign a non-aggression pact with Germany in self defense".

Independent Neue Zuercher Zeitung reported in some detail on Khrushchev's altercation with the British Labor leaders, stating that the visibly cool reception of the British public and the adamant steadfastness of the British government finally caused him to show his true colors. After describing the scene in very sarcastic terms, Neue Zuercher Zeitung concluded by saying "Khrushchev finally departed and left behind a great stink". The newspaper further stated that this event proved to "illusionists of all parties" the fundamental difference in values between the Soviet leaders and respectable persons in Great Britain, and quoted a Daily Mail statement that this scene certainly did not promote the people's front idea.

X

1/13/81

Comment on the Question of Social  
Democrats Behind the Iron Curtain

X

Denmark

1/13/81

Copenhagen Social-Demokraten of 26 April editorialized that the British Labor Party had for several years urged negotiations on the highest governmental level with the USSR.

"But", the editorial continued, "it is equally certain that the British Labor Party does not, any more than other Social Democratic parties, desire party cooperation or joint efforts of any kind with the Communist dictatorship parties. It is another thing that the Party wished to avail itself of the opportunity for an exchange of views with the Soviet leaders, which is the reason they were invited to the dinner".

"Free discussion was the aim, which might furnish an impression of Khrushchev's position on various concrete problems. This aim the dinner fulfilled, although as a social occasion it was a complete fiasco, with bitter and emotional debate taking the place of polite intercourse".

"When Khrushchev was asked to cause the release of the many Social Democrats in the prisons and labor camps of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, his answer was an angry refusal. He simply denied that Social Democrats existed in the USSR, and said that the satellite states were none of his business"!

"There is no reason to believe that the eventful dinner will influence the outcome of British-Soviet negotiations, nor was this intended by Labor, which in the negotiations see a possibility for relaxation of tensions between East and West".

"The meeting with the Labor leaders must have been a bitter disappointment to Khrushchev. Here he had his first opportunity to propagandize for the Popular Front slogan of the Soviet Communists, and spoiled it all with his uncompromising and angry 'nyet'".

"It would, of course, be impossible to bridge the ideological abyss between Democratic Socialism and dictatorship Communism with a promise of release of imprisoned Social Democrats. But such a promise could have contributed to a milder atmosphere".

"As a social occasion, the dinner was a complete failure, but with respect to politics and parties it was very revealing".

In another editorial, entitled "Strange Epilogue", Copenhagen Social-Demokraten returned to the theme of the Labor Party dinner for Bulganin and Khrushchev and said that it was astonishing that Khrushchev on his return to Moscow from Great Britain had bitterly attacked the British Labor Party. The editorial continued:

"It is surprising that Khrushchev harbored so much anger over what happened at the dinner. The sharp interruptions of his speech are not hard to understand, since it contained flagrant provocations. And his anger at Gaitskell's request concerning imprisoned Socialists is equally difficult to understand. In the first place he was here afforded an

SECRET

excellent opportunity to disown Stalinist miscarriages of justice, and in the second place he was evidently not similarly annoyed when Eden, in the course of his negotiations with the Soviet leaders, handed them a list of political leaders behind the Iron Curtain, including Social Democrats, Catholic bishops, and Peasant Party leaders".

The editorial went on to mention the campaign of the Moscow press against the British Labor Party, saying, among other things: "What the Communist press has started is a campaign to split the Labor Party and undermine the positions of both the Party and Gaitskell. The explanation for this is simple -- Moscow regards Gaitskell and his party as the most important obstacles to the establishment of a world-wide 'popular front', i.e., a mixture of dictatorship Communism and Democratic Socialism".

Other Danish papers scanned, Berlingske Tidende, Conservative, and Land og Folk, Communist, printed only factual reports.

#### Norway

Oslo Conservative Aftenposten of 27 April (PM edition) carried an article over the signature M, dealing with Bulganin and Khrushchev's visit to Great Britain in general, and saying about the incident in question in particular: "Long after the generalities of the communique have been forgotten, the clash between Khrushchev and the Labor leaders at the dinner will be remembered".

SECRET

"Between the Socialists of the West and the Moscow Communists, no ideological bridge was built. They still stand on opposite sides of an abyss".

Other Norwegian newspapers scanned, Labor Arbeiderbladet, Oslo, 25 April - 4 May; and Friheten, Communist, Oslo, 25 April - 4 May, carried only factual reports.

#### Sweden

Stockholm Conservative Svenska Dagbladet of 28 April said in an editorial:

"Resistance to the new Soviet infiltration technique has not been limited to the members of the British government. That the leaders of the Labor party so clearly demonstrated their own policy line, and did not hesitate to bring up the question of their party comrades who are imprisoned or have disappeared in the countries behind the Iron Curtain, must have been felt as a severe setback by the men who at the present time are frenetically propagandizing for a 'Popular Front' in all countries".

Stockholm Dagens Nyheter, Liberal, of 25 April, said, in commenting editorially on Khrushchev's reply to the question of the Labor leaders concerning Socialists behind the Iron Curtain:

"There is no reason to be astonished or shocked at Khrushchev's statement, although it may be said that in its unconcealed brutality his reply seemed to be poor psychology considering his courting of

the British public. Gaitskell's question probably hit the Soviet Party Secretary in such a sensitive spot that he was unable to conceal his feelings -- which was just as well. Even though the repulsive courting of Malenkov by the British public was not repeated, there are still in and outside Great Britain too many people who are willing to believe that smiles and bold gestures, toasts and laughter necessarily have something to do with peace and relaxation of tensions".

Other Swedish newspapers scanned, Stockholm Morgen-Tidningen, Social Democrat, 25 April - 3 May, and Ny Dag, Communist, 25 April - 3 May, carried only factual reports.



X

1/13/81

Belgium

The only mention made by Communist Le Drapeau Rouge, the only Belgian newspaper reviewed, of the altercation between the Soviet leaders and the British Labor party leaders was made in connection with the farewell call of a Labor Party delegation on Bulganin and Khrushchev and their supposed apology for the events at the dinner. The only statement made by the newspaper about the dinner itself was that Gaitskell and several other Socialist leaders tried to provoke Bulganin and Khrushchev by raising the question of the Socialists supposedly imprisoned in the USSR. The paper further stated that Gaitskell seems to have retreated in the face of opposition within his own party because at the end of the farewell interview, he declared that he did not submit any list and stated that the farewell was cordial.

X

1/10/87

Niskanen  
Finnish

In the Finnish press scanned from 25 to 28 April and 3 to 6 May, Helsingin Sanomat, the independent Finnish daily, carried a factual report by its own correspondent on 25 April on the Labor Party dinner at which Gaitskell presented Khrushchev with the list of Social Democrats behind the Iron Curtain. The article stated that the act "dampened spirits but cleared the air". On 3 May, Helsingin Sanomat carried a factual report speculating that Eden might have discussed the matter with the Soviet leaders and on 4 May carried a report on the Manchester Guardian story. No editorial comment was found on these incidents.

Suomen Sosialidemokraatti, the Social Democrat daily, carried a factual AFP dispatch on the Labor Party dinner on 25 April and on 4 May carried a Reuters dispatch on the Manchester Guardian story. No editorial comment was found in the period 25-28 April and 3-6 May.

Tyokansan Sanomat, the Communist daily, did not report the Labor Party dinner incident but on 27 April reported that the Labor Party leaders, including Gaitskell, had visited Khrushchev to apologize for their behavior. The article further stated that the Labor Party members, the press, and Parliament had criticized the leaders for their behavior and bad judgment in selecting the time and place for the discussion of the matter. On 4 May, Tyokansan Sanomat, carried an SIB (Soviet Information Bureau) report from Moscow criticizing the British Labor Party leaders for poisoning the air. The article stated that the action was motivated

by the "desire of the Labor Party leaders to inspire the opponents of united action and united front in the other western countries". On 5 May, Tyokansan Sanomat reported the press conference which Khrushchev held on his return to Moscow. No editorial comment was found on the matter.

Vapaa Sana, the pro-Communist daily, on 26 April carried a Reuters dispatch stating that the Labor Party was critical of Gaitskell and also an AFP dispatch reporting that the delegation of Labor Party leaders had apologized to Khrushchev for their behavior. On 6 May, Vapaa Sana carried a Reuters dispatch from London saying that Gaitskell had lost support in his party for his action at the dinner. No editorial comment was found on the incidents.

X

H/B/81

West German Newspaper Reaction to Khrushchev's Refusal

To Discuss Socialists Imprisoned in the USSR

Hamburg, Die Welt, 25 Apr 56. One paragraph of a long front-page news report briefly states that K. refused to accept Labour's intervention despite Bevan's and Gaitskell's urgent request.

\_\_\_\_\_, 26 Apr 56. Front page news article points out several times that, in consequence of K.'s rebuff of Labour, Labour has become still more suspicious of the Soviets than the Conservatives are.

\_\_\_\_\_, 27 Apr 56. A long front page news article reports in its final paragraph that Gaitskell told newspapermen the talks with the Russians had been frank and cordial, even though there continued to exist a basic difference of opinion between the two parties concerning the imprisoned Social-Democrats behind the Iron Curtain.

Hamburg, Hamburger Abendblatt, 24 Apr 56. A news report entitled "Cool Reception from Labour" says that Gaitskell's "request for the release of 200 socialists languishing in satellite prisons appears to have found deaf ears, a fact contributing to the spoiling of mood. In spite of that, Labour circles in particular still cherish some hopes with regard to the official negotiations".

Hamburg, Hamburger Abendblatt, 25 Apr 56. A second-page news article begins as follows: "Rumors have it in London that Khrushchev has been badly upset at the Labour reception for the Soviet guests. He evidently did not forgive Gaitskell's inquiry into the situation of the imprisoned socialists in the satellite countries. The irritation was noticeable when the Soviet leaders visited the House of Commons yesterday".

\_\_\_\_\_, 26 Apr 56. A second-page news article entitled "Trouble with Labour" relates that Gaitskell and 4 other socialists visited B and K in their hotel, presumably to get straightened out with them. It goes on to say that a Soviet diplomat has accused Gaitskell of a breach of confidence because of the public having been informed about the clash between the Soviet leaders and Labour without the former having had an opportunity for an official clarification of their position. The article further quotes Labour Party secretary Phillipps who said that they simply could not miss this opportunity of trying to do something on behalf of their socialist comrades. Furthermore, the article points out that the British conservatives are enraged about Gaitskell having made such a bid for publicity as to having approached the Soviet leaders outside the official discussions with the prisoner issue, and the article adduces the Daily Telegraph criticism of Gaitskell's "political coup". The article further adds, in heavy print, that the Labour executive intends to submit to the Soviet Embassy a list of

political prisoners with a request to have this list forwarded to the Soviet authorities. The article concludes its account of this issue by adding: "The Labour rebels in the leftist camp who reproach the government for not having done enough for an understanding with Russia now are in for a hard time".

Duesseldorf, Freies Volk (Communist), 25 Apr 56. Emil Carlebach, special London correspondent, reports that he can well imagine how much West German newspapers might make of a so-called "clash" between the Labour Party and the Soviet leaders, but actually, he continues, Khrushchev had not wanted to speak at all at the Labour reception and when he finally yielded to the repeated requests of Labour leaders and did speak, he "answered some questions with regard to which differences of opinions exist between the Socialists and the Communists".

\_\_\_\_\_, 26 Apr 56. Carlebach reports that he tried to talk to Labour leaders about the Soviets. He got hold of George Brown and asked him whether the reports of the "reactionary press" were correct according to which Khrushchev had refused to shake hands with Brown [at the Claridge Hotel reception]. Brown only laughed, according to Carlebach and answered: "I shook hands with both Bulganin and Khrushchev and am glad to have had this opportunity. Khrushchev is a great man. [Note: Brown appears to have said, actually, that Khrushchev was a "real character" which, in Carlebach's German translation "wirklicher Charakter" means, to all German readers, "great man"].]

Frankfurt/Main, Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, 26 Apr 56. A front-page news article points out that the disturbance over K.'s reaction at the Labour Party dinner continues unabated, and that Philips announced that the party had not intended to submit the list of the 150 imprisoned socialists, which he had on his person, during the dinner, which suggests, says the article, that the list was perhaps to be submitted after the dinner and would have been submitted if K. had not reacted so violently. The overall impression of the whole incident, the article says, is that the Labour Party is greatly disappointed in K. Now the list will have to be submitted through the Soviet Embassy, it concludes.

France

French Press Coverage of Khrushchev, Bulganin Visit to Great Britain

As expected, L'Humanite, Paris Communist daily, gave the biggest spread to the visit of Bulganin and Khrushchev to Great Britain. Issues from 18 through 23 April published front-page items with bold headlines. Special correspondents described the favorable welcome accorded the Soviet leaders, discussed the agendas of the meetings, and the itinerary of their trip. An article on 18 April, one pages 1 and 3, for example, referred to the possibility of trade talks and discussions of the Near East problem. The only editorial, which was published on 19 April, page 3, discussed the historic importance of the trip and <sup>its</sup> effect on France.

Franco-Tireur, Paris Leftist daily, published articles by special correspondent Pierre Narbonne describing the progress of the talks, but treating the visit with some sarcasm. (Papers from 18 to 21/22 April). Most articles were approximately two columns in length.

Le Monde, Paris neutralist daily, of 18-22/23 April printed only one editorial (devoted mainly to Near East question) intimating that Britain, although not enthusiastic about the visit, did not want to be responsible for renewing the cold war. Articles by special correspondent Jean Wetz were published in almost every issue, and several AFP and UP dispatches were published. Articles by Wetz were mostly factual with little commentary.

La Marseillaise, Marseille Communist daily, from 18 to 22 April used bold headlines to introduce articles by special correspondent Daniel Biegel. Several articles dwelt on "favorable atmosphere" in London and the enthusiastic welcome accorded the Soviet leaders by the English people.



Le Figaro, Paris moderate daily, published factual news reports in every issue from 18 to 23 April. An article on 20 April suggests that there is considerable strain between the Soviet and British diplomats.

Le Patriote du Sud-Ouest, Toulouse Communist daily, featured front-page news articles which emphasized the enthusiastic welcome accorded the Soviet leaders in London. Issues from 18 to 21 April dwelt on the cordial atmosphere prevailing during the talks.

Italy

The visit of the Soviet leaders to Great Britain was well covered by the Italian press ( L'Unita , Rome Communist daily, 19 and 20 April; La Stampa , six-times weekly liberal independent newspaper from Turin, 19-24 April; and Il Giornale d'Italia , Rome pro-government independent newspaper , 19 and 20 April) ~~was widely covered~~, particularly by L'Unita and La Stampa , with about ~~minimum~~ half of the front page devoted to the visit. Both papers also carried large photographs of the leaders being welcomed by Eden and Belwyn Lloyd. ~~On~~ Il Giornale d'Italia , on the other hand, carried a small article on page 6 in its 19 April issue, and on 20 April carried an equally short article on the front page , but with no photographs.

The main difference in the coverage of the visit in these three newspapers is that, while L'Unita speaks of the "warm welcome" extended the Soviet leaders, La Stampa and Il Giornale d'Italia keep emphasizing the reserve and lack of enthusiasm on the part of British crowds.

Only two editorials appeared during the period ~~under~~ under study; the 19 April issue of L'Unita asserted that this visit will do much to bridge the gulf between the two countries that developed 10 years ago as an aftermath of the famous speech by Churchill in Fulton, Missouri, when he coined the slogan "iron curtain." An editorial by Ferdinando Vegas in the 19 April issue of La Stampa ~~warned~~ warned that this visit is simply another maneuver of the Soviet leaders to accomplish their ultimate goal which apparently the cold war, started by Stalin, has failed to reach.

Switzerland

Neue Zuercher Zeitung, independent Swiss newspaper, on 18-19 April published numerous detached and mildly sarcastic articles on the Bulganin-Khrushchev visit to Great Britain in its three daily editions. It emphasized that the<sup>re</sup> were no enthusiastic, applauding crowds to welcome the Soviet leaders, and most everywhere they went, they were mainly observed by silent Britains. Neue Zuercher Zeitung compared this visit with that of Peter the Great in 1698 when he visited Britain incognito to learn British ship-building secrets, but emphasized that today the Red flag is larger than the British, and the Red air force not only stronger but also more modern.

No other Swiss newspaper were available.

West Germany

West German reaction to the Bulganin-Khrushchev visit in England

An editorial by Heinz Hoepfl entitled "The Russians Are Coming" on the first page of the 18 April issue of Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, covering a third of the page, predicts that these are going to be difficult days for Eden, since the Soviets hold all the trumps with regard to Near Eastern problems which are of vital interest to the British. Hoepfl also evaluates the significance of the visit to the problem of German reunification and points out that it should not be forgotten that it is not a vital British problem, however much Eden may be in favor of it.

No other papers from West Germany for period from 18 April available.

Belgium

Communist Le Drapeau Rouge, the only Belgian newspaper available, on 18-19 April published lengthy and very detailed accounts of the arrival of Bulganin and Khrushchev in Great Britain. The 19 April issue carried pictures of the Soviet leaders and described their every move from the time of their arrival at Portsmouth to their welcome by Eden in London. Brief mention of the previous disturbances was made, but Le Drapeau Rouge stated that Malenkov's very successful visit no doubt broke the ice for a warm welcome for Bulganin and Khrushchev. Mention was made that <sup>the</sup> cry of "Long Live Peace" and "We Fought Side by Side" were heard from the welcoming crowd.

The Netherlands

Visit of Khrushchev and Bulganin to Great Britain

The Amsterdam Communist daily De Waarheid of 18 April, in a lengthy article on the arrival of Khrushchev and Bulganin in Great Britain, stated that it is generally expected that the visit of the two Soviet officials will result in closer cooperation between the USSR and Great Britain concerning the German problem, disarmament, and trade. This expectation has been expressed by "the British man in the street," the foreign correspondents in Great Britain, and the British newspapers, the paper continued.

Finnland

Of the date span 18 April to the present, the Finnish newspapers for 18 April only were available. Of the six daily newspapers scanned for 18 April, Helsingin Sanomat, the independent newspaper, carried greater coverage on the visit than any other paper. Helsingin Sanomat carried four UP dispatches from London dated 17 April on the arrangements and events leading to the visit and also one long article from London by its own correspondent there discussing the hope that the visit would result in the relaxation of world tensions stating that the feeling in London was that ~~the~~ would involve more than "smiles, gifts, and patting children on the head". Tyokansan Sanomat, the Communist organ, carried only an AFP dispatch of 17 April from London. Vapaa Sana, the pro-Communist paper, mentioned nothing about the visit. Suomen Sosialidemokraatti, the Social Democrat paper, carried the AFP dispatch of 17 April from London, and also a quote from Kauppalahiti saying that time would determine the success and purpose of the visit. Maakansa, the Agrarian paper, carried a Reuters dispatch of 17 April from London and an RB dispatch from Copenhagen discussing security measures and the trip, respectively. Uusi Suomi carried two Reuters dispatches on the visit, the one from London discussing security measures and the one from Moscow discussing Khrushchev's birthday enroute, and also an article stating there was hope for peace and quoted various British newspapers showing their attitude of hope.

Norway

Oslo Conservative daily Aftenposten printed in its 17 April PM edition a despatch from its London Correspondent stating, among other things, that the British are looking forward to the visit with mixed feelings, that church circles are protesting against the visit, and that in the eyes of the British people the anti-Stalin campaign places the Soviets in anything but a favorable light. Subsequent issues of both the AM and PM ~~Aftenposten~~ ~~from 18 to 21 April~~ editions published factual articles on the visit up through 23 April which was last date available. Most articles were prominently featured on front page with pictures. The *papers* London correspondent, in the 19 April AM edition of Aftenposten, noted ~~that~~ with interest that Bulganin played "first fiddle" of the two, and that he was the first to extend greetings; Krushchev played a more passive role. The ~~frontal articles~~ 19 April AM edition also emphasized the friendly start of the meetings, while the 20 April AM edition noted ~~Klen's~~ attempt to set a tone for the conferences by asking the guests whether they intended to negotiate in all seriousness. Aftenposten devoted much space in its factual articles to security measures taken by British police.

The only editorial in the span of Aftenposten examined was a leading article in the 21 April AM edition which concluded that it would be unrealistic to expect any news of rapprochement on the German problem to come of the meeting. The editorial ~~stated among other things~~ was entitled "The London meeting and Germany". ~~and~~

Oslo Labor Paper, Arbeiderbladet, in its issues from 18-to 22 April gave only AP despatches from London. No editorial comment.

Communist Friheten, from 18 to 22 April carried only Reuter despatches.



Denmark

No papers for period from 18 April on, available.

Luxembourg

The only Luxembourg newspaper available, Communist Zeitung of 18 and 19 April, spoke glowingly of Bulganin and Khrushchev's welcome in Great Britain. Banner headlines introduced articles which spoke hopefully of an end to the cold war "which even British newspapers, which are hostile to an international detente, had to admit was practically taking place." The remainder of the articles was a factual account of the welcoming ceremonies and trip from Portsmouth to London with only a brief mention of the disturbances (defacing of the Karl Marx statue and bombing attempt on the Tass office) prior to the arrival of the Soviet dignitaries.

Sweden, Austria

Stockholm Communist daily paper, Ny Dag, only, available for span.

Carried factual articles only with no editorial comment.

No Austrian press ~~available~~ available for span.